

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO). I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,679		12/29/2000	Anthony X. Jarvis	00-BN-067 (STMI01-00067)	9128
30425	.7590	08/12/2004		EXAM	INER
		RONICS, INC.	O BRIEN, BARRY J		
	ATION 234 CTRONICS	· ·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CARROL	LTON, TX	75006		2183	
				DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/751,679	JARVIS ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Barry J. O'Brien	2183
The MAILING DATE of this communica	tion appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2004 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required in rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	uired to avoid abandonment of thi either: (1) a timely filed amendm of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in
·	FOR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from	the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date event, however, will the statutory period for reply ex- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST RE 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the per	wire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing the perfect of the perfect of the perition under 3 (a). The date on which the petition under 3 (a) of extension and the corresponding amount of the corre	ng date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension feount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ur
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an three months after the mailing date of th	e final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereo		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be		
(a) they raise new issues that would req	uire further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (s	ee Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the ap issues for appeal; and/or	plication in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying
(d) they present additional claims without	out canceling a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed amendm
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) rapplication in condition for allowance be		een considered but does NOT place t
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consiraised by the Examiner in the final reject		SOLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed an explanation of how the new or amended	nendment(s) a)⊠ will not be ente claims would be rejected is provi	red or b) will be entered and an ded below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) a	s follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-25		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disappro	oved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure	e Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
10. Other:	Best Availat	
	. 1	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment to independent claims 1, 11 and 21 would change the scope of the claims. Previously, the claims had no recitation of the controller being capable of determining whether every syllable of an instruction was stored in the first buffer. However, the proposed amendment would change the scope of the claims by adding the limitation that the controller is able to use a stop bit in the highest syllable of an instruction to determine whether every syllable of the instruction has been stored in the first buffer. Thus, the claim language would go from no recitation of using stop bits to determine anything to now further defining the use of stop bits to determine if all syllables of an instruction have been stored in the first buffer. This constitutes a change in scope that would require further search and/or consideration.

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100